

Serial Number
09/636,393

PU050092

Remarks

Claims 1-12, 14-15, 18-50 are pending.

Claims 1-12, 14-15, and 18-50 are rejected.

Claim 1 is amended to recite that content is not permitted to be sent if the content provider is unauthorized.

Claim 2 is amended to recite the case of what happens if a content provider is unauthorized, where a user request is rerouted to an authorized content provider.

Claim 4 is amended apparently to fix an apparently error in the claim, from being an authorized content provider to being an unauthorized content provider.

Claim 8 is amended to incorporate elements of cancelled dependent Claims 13, 16, and 17.

Claims 28 and 42 are amended to incorporate the concepts of authorized and unauthorized content providers.

No new matter was added in view of these amendments.

I. 35 U.S.C. 102(e) Rejection of Claims 1-50

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-50 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated in view of Ben-Shaul et al. (U.S. Patent Publication 2002/0010798, which issued as US patent 6,976,090, hereafter referred to as 'Ben-Shaul'). Applicants disagree with this ground of rejection.

A. Rejection of Claim 1

Claim 1 claims an element of a third party operating where the third party permits "permitting the enhanced content programming to be provided to the receiver over the network in response to the user request only if the content provider is an authorized content provider of the third party and preventing the transmission of content to said user if said content provider is unauthorized,

Serial Number
09/636,393

PU050092

wherein said permitting step is performed by said third party". This claimed element is neither disclosed nor suggested in Ben-Shaul.

Specifically, Ben-Shaul describes situations of the authorization of a client, not a content provider (see paragraph 426 of Ben-Shaul). Specifically, Ben Shaul states at paragraph 426

"It is possible, however, that the content provider permits downloading of such content only after the user requesting the material has been authorized or otherwise properly identified. For example, free software is typically given after a proper form has been completed. In such a case the origin server 10 dynamically links the authorized user, such as the client 14 to the downloaded material after obtaining a registration or authorization. In this situation, it is normally inappropriate for the origin server 10 to remotely cache such content. Yet, since such entries are non-cacheable, the load on the origin server 10 and its latency could increase significantly," (emphasis added)

Ben-Shaul discloses the complete opposite of what is claimed in Claim 1. That is it is the content provider this authorized, versus whether a client is authorized. This fundamental difference in the present invention and Ben-Shaul, is readily apparent throughout the teachings of Ben-Shaul. Moreover, the reference does not disclose or suggest what happens if a content provider is authorized or unauthorized.

B. Rejection of Claim 2

Claim 2 claims a step of "further comprising the step of determining if the content provider is authorized by the network operator to offer enhanced content programming over the network, wherein said request for said content is intercepted by said third party and rerouted by said third party to said authorized content provider for said enhanced content programming if said user request was directed to said unauthorized content provider."

Specifically, Ben-Shaul describes situations of the authorization of a client, not a content provider (see paragraph 426 of Ben-Shaul). Specifically, Ben Shaul states at paragraph 426

"It is possible, however, that the content provider permits downloading of such content only after the user requesting the material has been authorized or otherwise properly identified. For example, free software is typically given after a proper form has been completed. In such a case the origin server 10 dynamically links the authorized user, such as the client 14 to the downloaded material after obtaining a registration or authorization. In this situation, it is normally

Serial Number
09/636,393

PU050092

inappropriate for the origin server 10 to remotely cache such content. Yet, since such entries are non-cacheable, the load on the origin server 10 and its latency could increase significantly," (emphasis added)

Ben-Shaul does not disclose the redirection of a request for content, if a content provider is unauthorized, to an authorized content provider.

C. Rejection of Claim 4

The Examiner rejected Claim 4 by referring to paragraph 414 of Ben-Shaul. Upon review of this paragraph, it appears that it discloses a method of how to resolve a Domain Name Server request (or apparently how to resolve a Domain Name to an IP address), see Figs. 14 and 16. This has nothing to do with whether a content provider is authorized or not.

D. Rejection of Claim 7

The Examiner rejected Claim 7 by referred to paragraphs 22, 72, and 107 of Ben-Shaul. Specifically, the claim claims the elements of "intercepting a request to finalize said supplemental user request" and "finalizing said supplemental user request". There is nothing in these cited sections of Ben-Shaul that would distinguish between these finalizing steps and what would be the alternative, an intermediate step.

Paragraph 22 of Ben-Shaul discloses the operation of VPNs, firewalls, and other types of architectures for network caching and security. Paragraph 72 discloses the redirection of a request for content to an edge server (which has nothing to do with whether a content provider is authorized or not, but rather based on basic principles of edge server technology). Paragraph 107 is control parameters involving cookies. None of these disclosures of Ben-Shaul disclose the elements of Claim 7.

E. Rejection of Claim 8

As amended, Claim 8 recites the elements of an authorized content provider and an unauthorized content provider. As explained above, these concepts are not present nor suggested in Ben-Shaul.

Serial Number
09/636,393

PU050092

F. Rejection of Claim 25

For reasons similar to what was argued for Claim 7, Ben-Shaul does not disclose operations for "finalizing", as claimed in Claim 25. That is, there is no distinguishing elements between a "final" type of operation versus an operation which is not "finalized" in Ben-Shaul, as suggested by the Examiner.

G. Rejection of Claim 28

As amended, such a claim introduces the concept of an authorized and unauthorized content provider. See Claims 1 and 8 above.

H. Rejection of Claim 42

As amended, such a claim introduces the concept of an authorized and unauthorized content provider. See Claims 1 and 8 above.

Having fully addressed the Examiner's rejections it is believed that, in view of the preceding amendments and remarks, this application stands in condition for allowance. Accordingly then, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully solicited. If, however, the Examiner is of the opinion that such action cannot be taken, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's attorney at (609) 734-6809, so that a mutually convenient date and time for a telephonic interview may be scheduled.

Applicants request that any fees owed in connection with this action be charged to Deposit Account 07-0832.

Respectfully submitted,

/Joel M. Fogelson/
By: Joel M. Fogelson
Reg. No. 43, 613
Phone (609) 734-6809

Patent Operations
Thomson Licensing Inc.
Two Independence Way

Serial Number
09/636,393

PU050092

P.O. Box 5312
Princeton, New Jersey 08543-5312
June 27, 2007